

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of 20 January 2004. Claims 1-34 are pending in the application, Claims 1, 3-14, 23-32 and 34 have been allowed; Claims 2, 16-18, and 33 have been rejected; and Claims 15 and 19-22 have been objected to.

By this Response and Amendment, Claims 16-18 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 2, 15, 19, 26, and 33 have been amended.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments above and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 15 and 19-22 have been objected to.

With respect to Claim 15, the Examiner states that the language "disposed the copper" is unclear, and suggests that this portion of the Claim be amended to read "disposed on the copper".

With respect to Claims 19-22, the Examiner states that these are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, Claim 15 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to correct the grammatical error. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a non-narrowing amendment, and that no change in the scope of Claim 15 is intended.

By this amendment, Claim 19 has been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim (i.e., Claim 16) and all the intervening claims (i.e., Claims 17-18). Since Claims 20-22 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended Claim 19, they also now include the limitations of the base Claim and all the intervening Claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to Claims 15 and 19 overcome the objections to Claims 15 and 19-22.

Rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 2 and 33 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis for variously recited limitations.

By this amendment, Claim 2 has been amended to replace the word "cutting" with the "laser etching" so that it is consistent with the language of its base Claim, i.e., Claim 1. Claim 33 has been amended to depend from Claim 32 rather than from Claim 31, so that antecedence for "the at least one graphical symbol" is now properly provided.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to Claims 2 and 33 cure the defects under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, regarding the proper establishment of antecedent basis, and therefore the rejection of Claims 2 and 33 have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 16-18, have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Owen, et al., (US Patent 5,593,606).

By this amendment, Claims 16-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of this amendment, the rejections of Claims 16-18 under 35 USC 102(b), have been rendered moot.

Applicant may pursue the subject matter of these cancelled Claims in a continuation application which may be filed during the pendency of this application.

Amendment to Claim 26


Claim 26 has been amended to correct a typographical error. It is clear from the context that the third portion is determined by the third set of coordinates, and not by the first set of coordinates. No change to the scope of Claim 26 is intended by this correction.

Conclusion

All of the rejections in the outstanding Office Action of 20 January 2004 have been responded to, and Applicant respectfully submits that the pending Claims 1-15 and 19-34 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Raymond J. Werner  
Reg. No. 34,752

Dated: 01 March 2004  
Portland, Oregon